

The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI.

ST. LOUIS, MO., MARCH 31, 1904.

No. 13.

CASVISTRY AND CASES OF CONSCIENCE.



IN a scholarly review of P. Lehmkuhl's 'Casus Conscientiae' the reverend editor of the Bombay *Catholic Examiner* (LV, 6) gives a brief and lucid explanation of a subject concerning which many serious errors are current even among Catholics. We quote :

Morality, *subjectively* considered, means following one's own conscience ; but conscience, to be correct, ought to be in agreement with the objective moral truth about right and wrong. Viewed *objectively*, morality means conduct conformed to law.

Whether we know it or not, some actions are commanded and some are forbidden by law. There is first the divine law planted in nature. To this is added the divine law revealed by God. Part of this revealed law is merely a clearer exposition of the natural law ; part consists in positive enactments. "Thou shalt not steal" is a law both natural and revealed ; while "Keep holy the Sabbath" is a revealed law only. Thirdly, there are laws of the Church—disciplinary orders binding on all members. Lastly, there are the laws of the State.

A certain part of our conduct is covered and determined by these various laws ; but beyond the limits of law we are left to a blameless liberty of choice. If all laws were clear in themselves and in their application, there would be no cases of conscience ; but as a matter of fact, though 99 cases out of 100 in ordinary life are clear, the 100th case is always apt to turn up. Whether it turns up or not, it at least occurs to the mind of the moral theologian, and gives him a nut to crack. All sorts of difficulties arise. The law is not clear as to its limits or meaning ; circumstances enter in, which seem to make an exception. So that between one clear field of unquestionable freedom, and another clear field of un-

questionable obligation, there lies a wide belt of neutral territory—or rather, a sort of Venezuelan boundary not clearly pegged out on the ground and not clearly marked down in the map. Hence a dispute—some arguing on the side of restriction, others arguing on the side of liberty; some trying to prove the law, others trying to disprove it—both sides weighing the data in hope to arrive at a clear demarkation. While the matter remains uncertain, the subjective conscience has its own way. Those who think it clearly wrong must not do it; those who can not see a clear obligation are left free to do it or not—on the principle that unless the thing is clearly forbidden the right of liberty remains in possession.

A book of cases of conscience is a collection of such boundary questions with their solution. The use of such a book is twofold:—first, the actual settlement of intricate or perplexing questions; secondly, an embodiment of the general principles of moral theology in a number of concrete test cases. In the latter aspect, the work is a means of putting an ecclesiastical student through his facings, making sure that he can apply his principles.

This department of moral theology is called “case-law” or casuistry. [Casus, a case]. Casuistry has got a bad name among controversialists—as if it were a combine of subtle argument and lax principles for giving license to sin. The accusation is partly explained by the fact that in casuistry the business is to draw the exact limit of strict obligation; to cut down vague obligations to a definite compass, and to declare for liberty unless an obligation is clear. At the same time casuistry is never meant to open the way to laxity, still less to whittle down real duty. It is like the dissecting knife with which the surgeon refuses to cut unless he can cut clean. So casuistry refuses to impose an obligation unless the obligation is ascertained to be real.

It is sometimes said that Christian conduct would be very low if people acted according to casuistry. In a sense it would, as no one would then do more than the bare minimum of “absolute duty.” But it is never intended that Christians should follow casuistry. There is a higher range of conduct which a dutiful Christian will follow, and which all are urged to follow. The minimums of casuistry are not instilled into the people, or put into practice by those who study them. Nevertheless casuistry, or the study of minimums, is a useful and necessary science. It leaves the priest to guide souls according to a generous idea of duty; but at the same time prevents him from imposing as duties in the strict sense any more than is rigidly obligatory. The whole idea is aptly illustrated by Fr. Rickaby in this way:

According to the legal interpretation of the law, three miles dis-

tance from church excuses from the strict obligation of attending mass on Sundays. But if you have a carriage or bicycle and can easily come to church, you ought to come—taking the wider sense of the word “ought.” Yet if you absolutely insist, I admit that you are within your strict rights; only I strongly advise you to take a higher view of the matter and not cut things down to the bare minimum. I say you ought to come if you reasonably can. I do not say that you absolutely must. The “ought” is the ordinary rule of a Christian’s life. The must is the minimum of casuistry. A well instructed Catholic would say to himself: “I know that under these precise circumstances I am not legally obliged to attend. But in keeping with the spirit and aim of the law I ought to go unless I have a substantial excuse.”

Thus far the *Examiner*. Whoever desires to go into the subject more deeply, will find an instructive essay on “Casuistry” in Rickaby’s ‘Political and Moral Essays’ (Benziger Bros., 1902.)

Father Rickaby there quotes among other things a passage from ‘The Principles of Morals’ by Fowler and Wilson (part ii, pp. 247-248), which, in view of the misconceptions spread even by such authors as Sir James Mackintosh, is truly refreshing.

“It would be disingenuous,” says this high and venerable authority of the University of Oxford, “to conceal my opinion that the art of casuistry has often been most unjustly decried. It has unfortunately been associated, owing to the peculiar treatment of it by certain Jesuit divines,*) with lax views of morality, and especially of the virtue of veracity; but the association is mainly an accidental one; granted that duties may clash...or that general rules may be modified by special circumstances, it is surely most important to determine beforehand, so far as we can, what those circumstances are, and, in the case of clashing duties, which should yield to the other. Now this, and this alone, is the task which ‘casuistry,’ or the attempt to ‘resolve cases of conscience,’ proposes to itself. Owing to the infinite variety of the cases which may be imagined and the endless complexity of the circumstances which occur in actual life, the casuist may not be able, to any great extent, to anticipate practical difficulties; but he can, at least, always deal with cases which have already occurred, nor do the limitations of an art seem to furnish conclusive reasons against the attempt to exercise it.”

*) As for “certain Jesuit divines,” Father Rickaby, himself a member of the Society of Jesus, observes: “The fact is that some Jesuits did say some foolish things, and Pascal invented for them many more” (l. c., p. 214.)

ANNA EVA FAY EXPOSED.

[In the last volume of *THE REVIEW* we published several articles (pp. 89, 129, 174) on Anna Eva Fay and her strange feats of alleged clairvoyance or mind reading. Some of the surmises there made as to this woman's methods of deceiving the public, are now fully confirmed by G. Allie Martin and F. B. Moore, of Albuquerque, N. M., who recently, when Miss Fay gave performances in the Elks' Opera House of that city, went under the stage and made a thorough investigation. We give the result in Mr. Martin's own words, condensing a passage here and there.*—A. P.]

To give a "mind reading" performance like that with which Miss Fay entertains the public, a person simply needs a few cardboards with two slips of paper, a sheet of carbon paper between each, on either side; a speaking tube, a sheet, a clever man to go out in the audience and do the talking after the manner of Mr. Pingree, who is really Miss Fay's husband and manager, a few wide awake assistants scattered throughout the audience, and a quick man or woman under the stage at the other end of the speaking tube.

The cardinal feature of the performance is the cardboards with the carbon paper. These cardboards are passed through the audience for the spectators to use when writing their questions, and when a question is written, the pencil, by means of the carbon sheet, at once makes the impression on a sheet of paper on the inside of the pad.†) Sometimes several names and questions may be written almost in the same spot, but one is perhaps light and another dark, for no two people write alike or with the same degree of pressure on the pencil, and it is generally an easy matter for a handwriting expert to decipher all the names and all the questions. Sometimes it is not possible, however, to read every full name, and that accounts for Miss Fay sometimes calling a person's first or last name only, or even the initials.

If she can get the name or the initials, and a person will respond to them, she cares little for the question, for that is an easy matter. When the questions are all finished by the spectators, the cardboards are taken back on the stage, where Miss Fay and her assistant have an hour and a quarter to rip them open and decipher the names and questions that have been written in the front. These are transferred to other sheets of paper for the assistant to communicate later to Miss Fay through a speaking tube.

The speaking tube, this very important accessory, is pushed up through the floor of the stage, through a small hole that remains covered during the rest of the performance, as soon as Miss Fay

* Mr. Martin's report appeared in the Albuquerque Daily Citizen, of March 8th, 1904.

† This, as our readers may recollect, was substantially the explanation given by the Civiltà Cattolica, quoted in *THE REVIEW* (vol. x, p. 89.)

takes her seat and draws the sheet over her form for the reading. The tube comes up from below the stage floor and through it the assistant reads the names, questions, and answers to Miss Fay, who then calls them out.

Between the operator under the stage and the man in front of the house who does the talking and takes the questions, there is a means of communication. The runway on which the committee of citizens mount the stage in the early part of the performance, is not there for the sole purpose of assisting these individuals into the glare of the footlights. It is carefully draped on either side and is one of the most important features of the entertainment. In the center of this board, near the end next to the audience and where the clever manager so often rests his hand, as the audience will remember, there is a slot of sufficient size for him to drop slips of paper, and he does this as often as the occasion warrants. There is another assistant who catches them and carries them back to the operator at the lower end of the speaking tube, and it is by this means that Miss Fay reads the questions that are not written on her cardboards.

Mr. Pingree gets them from the writer and passes them down under the stage, where they are read. I will give an example. On Friday evening of last week Miss Fay called the name of Albert E. Peters, and he held up his hand as others do in answer to his name. Before his question was surrendered to Mr. Pingree, however, she called the name of another and began answering the other person's question, calling still another and another. In the meantime the accommodating Mr. Pingree had gone to Mr. Peters, for his question and Mr. Peters had surrendered it, expecting to be answered at once. Mr. Pingree, however, returned to the runway, rested his hand on it a second, and then suddenly, as if inspired, called: "Miss Fay, you have not yet answered Mr. Peters' question."

This was heard as well by the operator under the stage as by Miss Fay, and when Miss Fay replied that she was going to answer it, the operator below at once read it on to her, and the result was that Miss Fay told Mr. Peters that he was asking about a prize-fight and gave him a supposed answer. This made a great hit with the audience, just as it was expected to do.

Mr. Peters and his friends were puzzled and mystified, for they knew that he had written his question at home and had not used her cardboard. They did not know, however, that he had made the remark that day, in the presence of one of Miss Fay's company, that he would be there that night with his question. He did make such a remark, however, stating that he intended to write a question at home and that he was going to see if she could

read it. Miss Fay was therefore safe, when the member of the company reported that Mr. Peters would be in the audience, in calling his name and trusting to her able assistant, Mr. Pingree, to get the question and get it under the stage. In this she was right. Had Mr. Peters refused to deliver his question, Miss Fay's reply would have been that his thought continued to come to her, but in fragments, as he would not concentrate his mind sufficiently to enable her to read it. With this or something similar she would dismiss the question and arouse no suspicion.

She did the same thing with me. I wrote a question on a piece of paper, kept it in my pocket, and she called my name, knowing that I was in the house, but when I failed to surrender the paper when it was called for—the operator below reporting that it had not come down—she declared that I did not keep my mind on the subject and that she was therefore unable to read my question.

I have attended more than twenty-five of her performances in the past two years, and never did she answer a question for me till last Thursday. Previous to that time I had always written my questions on my own paper and refused to surrender them, but last Thursday I used her cardboard and wrote very heavily—I wanted to test her. She answered me almost as soon as her performance was commenced.

The carbon paper and the use of the secret passage under the stage are not the only schemes used to get at the thoughts and questions of the people in the audience. Miss Fay carries a company of people, almost a dozen, who do not appear as members of the company, and it is their business to learn what they can, at all times possible, so that she can use the information at the proper time.

These people are scattered throughout the audience when the house is first opened and they put in their time getting information about the people in the house and responding to certain names which Miss Fay may call. All this helps along with the performance wonderfully and is an essential part. When she wants to make an unusually good hit, she calls the name by which one of her employes is to respond. Say it is a woman—she proceeds to describe the clothing of the person named and tells her a great many details in reply to the supposed question, which never fails to make an impression with the rest of the audience. This woman will then perhaps move cautiously to another part of the house (I saw one woman move three times) when she will answer to another name and so on.

But this is not the most important function of these people. Their most important work is to listen to conversations and report them to Miss Fay. For instance, one of these paid employes

may be sitting beside a well-known woman and hear her say that she would like to know so and so, but is afraid to ask it. This employée of the company at once makes a mental note of this question, and if she does not leave to report it, she writes it down, pretending to be scribbling a question for the "mind reader," like the rest of the audience, later passing it to one of the men who take up the questions. On that one slip she may report the names of half a dozen people in her immediate vicinity. If she is unable to learn all the names, she describes the persons and indicates their conversation, and the man who takes up the paper finds out the names. The rest is easy sailing. The woman in the audience who has been talking to her friend, is then astonished to hear her name called and be told that she wants to know so and so, for she knows that she has never written the question. Her friend and several others in the same section may be surprised in a like manner without suspecting collusion.

Nor is this the only way they work it. Last Thursday evening a man sat in the first row of the dress circle next to me and he wrote a question on his own slip of paper, refusing the pad when proffered. He used the name of H. King, although that is not his real name, and as Miss Fay went on with her reading, she did not call his name and he became rather agitated. Noticing this, the assistant to Mr. Pingree came over to him and said: "Have you a question?" "Yes." "Well let me see it. Perhaps I can help you. Maybe Miss Fay can catch my thoughts quicker than she can yours," and "Mr. King" allowed Mr. Assistant to read the question. This Mr. Assistant was constantly writing on a small pad, tearing off slips and putting them into his pocket. This was all for a blind, for as soon as he had read "Mr. King's" question he resumed his scribbling—writing that name and question on a sheet of paper—and a second later he brushed by Mr. Pingree, and I saw him slip the paper into Mr. Pingree's hand. Pingree's arm suddenly became tired and after wandering carelessly to the runway he had to rest it again. He did so and the third question called after that was "Mr. King's." He wanted to know when he would make up with his girl, and Miss Fay told him that was his question and that they would make up before Easter. Yet "Mr. King" still held his question in his hand in plain view of the audience.

[To be concluded.]



PLAIN CHANT AND CONGREGATIONAL SINGING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REVIEW.—*Sir:*

In a foot-note to a comment on Pius X.'s proposed reform of church music in your always eagerly awaited REVIEW (vol. XI p. 11) you recently quoted approvingly the *Semaine Religieuse* of Paris as saying that the plain chant of Solesmes requires artists for its successful performance, and artists are rare, particularly in our church choirs." I have sung and accompanied the "Solesmes" choral for the last fifteen years, and before that I sang and accompanied for almost ten years the "Regensburg" choral. I may, therefore, be trusted for the accuracy of the following statements.

The Solesmes plain chant is published in a large and in a small edition. The larger edition (called the *Liber Gradualis*) contains Introitus, Graduale, Offertorium, and Communio for all the feasts and seasons of the year. The music of this larger volume is composed in the Gregorian (neumatic) style of choral, which often employs for one syllable whole groups of notes (neumata), which correspond to the flourishes and coloraturas in the modern classical music (*Kunstgesang*). It goes without saying that this Gregorian style of plain chant requires trained singers corresponding with the soloists in modern music. But I venture to say, without fear of being contradicted, that with half of the preparation which is given to modern "figured" church music, a moderately gifted singer will master even the most pretentious parts of the Solesmes *Liber Gradualis*. In the Benedictine monasteries the ancient custom of the Church is still observed, by which the music of the *Liber Gradualis* (i. e., the larger and more difficult book) is sung by the "schola cantorum" only (generally two or more trained singers.)

The smaller volume (called *Kyriale*, by Dom Pothier) contains Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Benedictus, and Agnus, and is supposed to be used by the chorus of clerics and the whole congregation. This book is written in the Ambrosian (syllabic) style of plain chant, which employs generally only one note for every syllable and corresponds to the modern "*Volksgesang*" and church hymn. This *Kyriale* is composed in such an easy style that any one, no matter how little gifted in music, can learn to sing it. The best proof for this assertion is the fact that in our monastery church as in most Benedictine churches, all the priests in the sanctuary, the clerics and students, and even children, sing in one chorus with ease the music of the *Kyriale*, and most of it by heart. The *Kyriale* is, therefore, admirably adapted for congregational singing, which Pius X. so much desires. I am told that

the *Missa Regia* (one of the sixteen masses contained in the *Solesmes Kyriale* and by no means the easiest of them) is sung and has been sung for the last two centuries by the whole congregation, men, women, and children, in many churches of Alsace-Lorraine and France..

I do fear, however, that one important point is overlooked in the proposed introduction of the *Solesmes plain chant* in all our churches. It requires experienced organists, well trained in thorough bass, to accompany the *Solesmes choral*, and where are these organists to be found in our rural, and even in the city parishes? A poor organist, that is one who plays a chord on every note, or who plays heavy chords on unaccented syllables, or who employs chords which mislead and impede the singers, will spoil the whole *Solesmes choral*, as it has to be rendered with great fluency and a light flexible voice. Before the *Solesmes plain chant* can be introduced, we must have a school or schools after the manner of the "*Choralcurse*" in the old country, in which organists are trained to accompany the chant properly and cantores are taught to sing the more difficult music of the *Liber Gradualis* correctly, fluently, and gracefully.

One more word on the much discussed subject of congregational singing. Congregational singing is desired by nearly every one, from the Pope down to the last clergyman and intelligent layman. But what kind of singing is desirable and what kind is practical? The songs in the hymnal of the late Paulist Father Alfred Young, composed by him for the express purpose of supplying the long-wanted music for congregational singing, and used for this purpose, I believe, by the Paulists in their own church in New York City, will never fill the bill; they will never be generally introduced even in the United States, much less anywhere else. For Father Young's hymns, although really excellent from a musical standpoint and deserving of the highest praise of musical critics, are somewhat difficult and do not appeal to the popular musical instinct. Besides, they smack too much of a Protestant church meeting.

Neither is the style of the German *Kirchenlied* adapted for general use in the whole Church. Although most of its melodies are beautiful and easily learned, and have that popular ring which is lacking in Father Young's hymns, they will not do for general use, because they are distinctly national, distinctly German—too solemn and serious for more choleric temperaments, too slow for quicker blood, too cold for warmer hearts, too deep for less philosophical minds. Besides, they too remind one somehow or other of Lutheran church songs, like "*Eine feste Burg ist unser Gott.*" I also suspect that Wessenberg and his kind were so zealous in

encouraging and fostering the German Kirchenlied in order to emphasize the German national church movement which they fathered. Truly, the only feasible method to secure the boon of congregational singing for the Catholic Church, is the plan of Pope Pius X. to return to the old melodies of plain chant, as they are found in the Solesmes Kyriale. They are easy to learn, as I have shown above, and if they are not yet popular, they certainly will become so as the ear grows familiar with them. In fact, even now familiar airs of plain chant, as the preface, the Salve Regina, the Ecce Lignum, the Exultet, the Te Deum, are more deeply rooted in the hearts of the Catholic people than all the melodies of modern music put together.

MT. ANGEL, ORE.

F. DOMINIC, O. S. B.

28 24 28

THE TRUE ENDS OF FREEMASONRY ARE UNKNOWN TO MANY OF ITS MEMBERS.

It will, perhaps, be a new idea to many a Mason that, though he has spent many a year in the order, he does not know its true aim. Were I to assert thus on my own authority, I would not expect him to believe me; but it is not I that say so, but Dr. Mackey in volumes which are "standard works" for the more learned and enquiring brethren in America. In his 'Masonic Symbolism' (p. 301) he puts the important question: "What, then, is the design of Masonry"? Here is his answer, verbatim:

"A very large majority of its disciples, looking only to its practical results, as seen in the every-day business of life—to the noble charities which it dispenses, to the tears of the widow which it has dried, to the cries of the orphans which it has hushed, to the wants of the destitute which it has supplied—arrive with too much rapidity at the conclusion that charity, and that too, in its least exalted sense of eleemosynary aid, is the great design of the institution. Others with a still more contracted view, remembering the pleasant reunions at their lodge banquets, the reserved communications which are thus encouraged, and the solemn obligations of mutual trust and confidence that are continually inculcated, believe that it was intended solely to promote the social sentiments and cement the bonds of friendship."

Having thus disposed of the large majority of his brethren as of those who, like the vast majority of religious bodies outside Catholicity, are ignorant of the true end and aim of the organization, since they falsely consider it to be a mere eleemosynary or social institution, he goes on to show that its purpose is essentially religious in as much as it is the search after the truth concerning

"the nature of God and of the human soul." Hence (p. 303) he concludes :

"Now, this idea of a search after truth forms so prominent a part of the whole science of Freemasonry, that I conceive no better or more comprehensive answer could be given to the question, 'What is Freemasonry?' than to say that it is a science which is engaged in the search after divine truth."

It is of this search, therefore, according to Dr. Mackey, that the vast majority of Masons are ignorant. They do not know the religious scope of the order and hence naturally consider that we talk at random when we assert the anti-Christian nature of Masonry. Would they hear more from the learned author's pen?

"In tracing the progress of Freemasonry," he says (p. 310), "and in detailing its system of symbolism, it has been found to be so intimately connected with the history of philosophy, of religion, and of art, in all ages of the world, that the conviction at once forces itself upon the mind, that no Mason can expect thoroughly to comprehend its nature, or to appreciate its character as a science, unless he shall devote himself, with some labor and assiduity, to the study of its system. The skill that consists in repeating with fluency and precision the ordinary lectures, in complying with all the ceremonial requisitions of the ritual, or the giving, with sufficient accuracy, the appointed modes of recognition, pertains only to the rudiments of the Masonic science".....

"Freemasonry, viewed no longer, as too long it has been" (p. 311), "as a merely social institution, has now assumed its original and undoubted position as a speculative science.... The universal cry throughout the Masonic world is for light; our lodges are henceforth to be schools; our labor is to be study; our wages are to be learning; the types and symbols, the myths and allegories of the institution are beginning to be investigated with reference to their ultimate meaning; our history is now traced by zealous enquiries as to its connection with antiquity; and Freemasons now thoroughly understand that often quoted definition that 'Masonry is a science of morality veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols.'"

As my quotation has but one object in view, viz: to prove, on competent authority, that a man may be a Mason of long standing and yet be ignorant of the ultimate aim of the order and the meaning of its symbols, I abstain from further comment on the passage. The Mason for whom Masonry is a mere benevolent institution in the ordinary acceptation of the word, the Mason who sees in Masonry mere sociability, will indeed be indignant that I call Masonry anti-Christian and urge his own personal experience as an argument against me. Dr. Mackey, however, kindly comes

to my assistance, bidding him remember that he is only in the rudimentary state of Masonic knowledge and has not yet grasped the ultimate purpose of Masonry, has rushed too rapidly to his conclusions, has taken too contracted a view of his surroundings.



BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

Sketches for Sermons, Chiefly on the Gospels, for the Sundays and Holydays of the Year. By Rev. R. K. Wakeham, S. S. 229. pp. Jos. F. Wagner, New York. Price \$1.25.

We feel sorry whenever to the thousand and one books of "sketches" a new one is added. We willingly grant that some are carefully worked out, though many are not; but to all there is this strong objection that they lead to undue haste and superficiality. Sketches are quickly perused, and the preacher is ready to "talk" on the subject for fifteen or twenty minutes. He knows what he is going to say; how to say it he will find out when he faces the inspiring multitude of his parishioners. Thus many a talent remains undeveloped through the influence of this kind of rhetorical literature. The noble art of preaching the Gospel is crippled by its use.

Fr. Wakeham's book, however, is not of this class. It would be almost impossible to abuse his sketches in the above described way. They are too full of thoughts and ideas to be mastered by a quick perusal. A selection has to be made, and in making it, the user is forced to work out his own sermon. Besides each sketch is interwoven with, and built up on, an abundance of Scriptural texts (of the large number which we compared, the references were always correct) which fact again makes an *ex tempore* reproduction impossible.

Only those will derive full benefit from these "sketches" who carefully read each one repeatedly. At the same time the reader will become aware of the necessity of "sketching" each sermon before "writing" it. He will see the importance of familiarity with the Scriptures. Last not least, almost every modern evil is mentioned in prudent but fearless and Apostolic language.—E.

✱

—We note that the latest contention as to the birth-place of St. Patrick accords the honor to the ancient city of Vicus in Spain; a theory which is supported ably in a book recently issued, entitled 'The Birthplace of St. Patrick,' and written by Vicar-General O'Brien of the Diocese of Derry.

MINOR TOPICS.

A New Professor for the Catholic University of America.—An esteemed friend of THE REVIEW requests us to print the following :

"Several Dutch Catholic dailies, as *De Tijd*, *Het Centrum*, and others, recently contained the important news that Dr. H. Poels had been appointed professor of Old Testament exegesis at the Catholic University of America. As the entire Catholic press of the Netherlands and also some Belgian papers mention this appointment, I have reason to suppose the news to be correct.

Dr. H. Poels is a priest of the Diocese of Ruremonde, who after the completion of the seminary course, was sent by his bishop to Louvain, where he graduated about six years ago with high honors.

This Dutch critic is, like the French Father Lagrange, a protagonist of the progressive tendency in the Catholic school of Biblical criticism. During the year 1899 he wrote a few articles in the *Katholiek* on the Pentateuch. His advanced views were, to say the least, displeasing to some ultra-conservative seminary professors. The result of this difference was the appointment of a committee by Bishop Bottemanne, in whose diocese the *Katholiek* is published, to examine the incriminated articles. Of the three theologians appointed, two were in favor of the continuation of Dr. Poels' series of articles on the Pentateuch. For safety's sake, however, the Bishop of Haarlem send some propositions taken from the articles to Rome. The answer which he received was : '*Prudenter egisti.*'

In the meantime the suspected author had successfully defended his views in a remarkable brochure, *Critiek en Traditie*. And a few months later he was appointed consultor of the Bible Commission established by Leo XIII.

Dr. H. Poels is not only a profound and brilliant Bible critic, but also a public-spirited man, a vigorous and eloquent speaker, who is much sought for at great public gatherings, e. g., the Dutch Katholiekendagen. He was for some years professor of Holy Scripture in a convent of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart, but since his appointment as consultor of the Pontifical Bible Commission he has been exclusively engaged in studying and writing.

The selection of Dr. Poels as professor at Washington is a happy one and will be a real gain to the University. The progressiveness of this eminent historian and theologian is strictly orthodox and his excellent qualities of mind and heart make him an ideal man, especially in this great and promising country, where the progressive and conservative Catholic forces must be brought together to work unitedly and efficiently for the intellectual and moral elevation of the entire people.—G. R., O. PRAEM."

For the Beatification of Pius IX.—French Catholics are addressing a petition to Pius X., requesting him to celebrate the jubilee of the definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary by inaugurating the canonical process for the beatification of the late Pope Pius IX. The petitioners recall the fact that, a

few months after the death of the illustrious Pontiff, the bishops of the province of Venice addressed themselves to Leo XIII, with a similar petition, in which they said, among other things: "May it please God and Your Holiness to give us permission, by your infallible word, to prostrate ourselves publicly before the image of our well-beloved Father, whom we admire as a martyr of patience, a confessor in firmness, an apostle in charity, and an angel in life." They repeat this petition and add to the motives which inspired it the following: the jubilee of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the grave dangers which threaten the Church from every side, and the circumstance that the surviving witnesses of the life and virtues of Pius IX. are daily growing less in number. And they conclude: "It is for these reasons, Most Holy Father, that we humbly prostrate ourselves at your feet and beg you to ordain that the canonical process of 'information' be opened upon the life and reputation for sanctity of that servant of God, Pius IX., and we protest in advance our entire submission to the decision which it may please your Apostolic authority to make in this matter." It is not necessary to instruct our readers on the import of this movement, which, we sincerely trust, spreading all over the Catholic world, will result in the beatification and final canonization of that glorious Pope who lives in history especially as the great champion of sound doctrine against modern Liberalism. THE REVIEW humbly but enthusiastically begs to add the signatures of its editorial staff to this timely petition.

More Free Parochial Schools.—Bishop Horstmann, on his recent visit to San Antonio, Tex., informed the *Southern Messenger* (xiii, 4) that in the Diocese of Cleveland "all the parish schools are practically free, and poor students are even supplied with books and necessary clothing."

In the Diocese of Columbus, there is at least one, as we are informed by Rev. Fr. Mark, O. M. Cap., pastor—St. Joseph's parish at Canal Dover, that "has a free parochial school since 1868."

One of the oldest free parochial schools in the country (we have already reported the earliest) is that attached to St. Peter's Church, New York, which was organized in the year 1800.

Father Walsh, in a recent interesting account of the free schools in Massachusetts, detailed the long success of the Catholic free schools that were organized in the early thirties of the last century, at Lowell, as a special part of the public school system and paid for out of the public taxes of the town.

It seems that our articles on the subject have stirred up considerable discussion. "One of the most important works, if not the most important, now before the Church in this country," says the *Southern Messenger* (No. 4), one of the several papers that have taken up the matter, "is the more general establishment of free parochial schools,—free, that is to say, in so far as the rudimentary branches of education are concerned. The facts set forth show plainly that such schools are feasible, and the plan is no longer in its experimental stage."

Religion, the Only Solution of the Divorce Problem.—Writing on the terrible divorce problem, a secular journal, the *St. Louis Mirror* [No. 48], says: "There may be and doubtless there is much

ground for the agitation of a uniform divorce law in all the States, as a mere matter of system, just as necessary as in the case of bankruptcy or in fire and life insurance laws, or in all laws of universal application to conditions that are the same or institutions that are the same everywhere. But there is no general demand for the restriction of divorce or for the prohibition of the marriage of divorced persons. There will be no such demand until the country returns to a religious conception of marriage. Religion is the only force, in one manifestation or another, that will keep institutions anything like the ideals to which they originally aspired, especially social institutions. Social institutions are chiefly endangered by passions, and religion is most powerful to restrain the passions. It is noticeable that those attempts at ideal communities which have been most nearly successful, have been so only under the influence of some religious idea or motive. So with marriage. As it loses its sacramental character, it loses its characteristic of indissolubility. But religion has been losing its force, and consequently marriage. . . . Divorce will be diminished only when the churches grow strong with a new life. The State can not make people moral. When it tries to do so, it invariably promotes immorality. We must look to a revival for the correction of most social evils."

Are We a Christian Nation?—We hope none of our readers will be misled, as we were by a review in the *N. Y. Times*, into purchasing 'Religious Freedom in American Education,' by Joseph Henry Crooker; for, in spite of its pretensions, it is a worthless and anti-religious pamphlet. We refer to it here primarily to warn the public against it, and secondarily to quote from it two sentences which are significant and confirm a view we have often expressed. Here they are:

"We are a Christian Nation in a certain sense, considered solely as a people; but the government of the United States is neither Christian nor infidel: it is simply non-religious" (p. 14).

"While some of our courts have held that Christianity is, in a certain way, the law of the land, yet these decisions have in the main been very vague; and, so far as any of them have taken ground against the purely secular theory of our government," (a theory which Mr. Crooker, though a minister of the gospel, idealizes, and for the defense and propagation of which he has written this book), "they have misstated the genius of our institutions, while they have been condemned by the manifest destiny and essential spirit of our National Life" (p. 16).

That is to say: we are not, and have no right to pretend to be, a Christian nation.

Why Small Boys Like to Make a Noise?—Our National Commissioner of Education has devoted some study to this psychological problem and come to the conclusion (cfr. *Globe-Democrat* of Dec. 27th), that the small boy likes to make a noise chiefly for the reason that, from the child's point of view, noise is an expression of power, and by making as much of it as possible, the boy likes to exhibit his power and importance in the world.

While Mr. Harris may be right in this, he is most assuredly "off" when he defines "the impulse to mischief" as "the expression

of a desire" (on the part of the child) "to control his environment, rather than to be controlled by it," and hence declares that "in a normal and healthy youngster," it "is not by any means to be regarded as an unwholesome symptom."

Mischief-making, even in the mild sense, implies essentially evil, and the impulse to do evil, which springs from original sin, is not a wholesome symptom; on the contrary, it is unwholesome and needs to be curbed if the mischief-loving boy is to grow to true manhood, which is Christian manhood.

Cardinal Gibbons in Favor of the Projected Catholic Daily.—His Eminence the Cardinal-Archbishop of Baltimore has addressed to one of the promoters of the project of starting a Catholic daily newspaper at Buffalo, under date of March 12th, the subjoined letter:

"I was very glad to hear from you, and I was much pleased with the announcement contained in your letter that a Catholic daily paper is soon to be issued in Buffalo with the approval of your Bishop. A daily journal animated by sound Catholic principles, conveying the most recent telegraphic news and items of general interest to the public, and at the same time free from the poison of prurient and sensational matter, meets with my cordial approval, and deserves to be liberally patronized."

—THE REVIEW has lost a staunch friend in Rt. Rev. Bishop L. M. Fink, O. S. B., whose recent demise has plunged the Diocese of Leavenworth into deep sorrow. It is only a few weeks ago since he wrote us the sympathetic lines which we printed in our No. 2, of January 14th, 1904, as coming "from a highly esteemed Western Bishop":

"I congratulate you on your strictly Catholic course and express the great pleasure with which I always read THE REVIEW; and I hope there are thousands more of the same sentiment. That a paper like yours can not please all and will displease some, is a matter of course. Continue as heretofore and you will enlarge your reading circle by and by. I wish you and THE REVIEW a very happy and prosperous New Year and God's blessing, that you may keep up courage."

To-day this sounds like a message from the grave, and we shall treasure it all the more reverently. May the noble Bishop rest in eternal peace!

—Rev. F. Rupert, of St. John's Church, Lima, O., who was charged in the *Lima Republican-Gazette* of Feb. 6th (see our quotation in No. 10, p. 157) with being a member and supporter of the Young Men's Christian Association (Y. M. C. A.), begs us to say that the "charge is a fabrication out of the whole cloth," and that he is "no more connected with the Y. M. C. A. than . . . with the Methodists or any other non-Catholic association." We are pleased to register his denial, but would take this opportunity to suggest that *it would be better in all such cases if such false statements were denied at once in the papers where they first appear.* A correction sent a month or two later to a far-distant weekly can not undo the harm which lies of this kind are apt to cause.

